

APHC010286882025



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3328]

THURSDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1428/2025

Between:

1. YALAMANCHILI SRI CHAITANYA DEV, MALE, AGED 54 YEARS,
OCC CULTIVATION, S/O. YALAMANCHILI MAHESH CHANDRA
CHOWDARY (LATE), NAVYA ENCLAVE, FLAT NO.204, ASHOK
NAGAR, ELURU. ELURU DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. G JAYA LAKSHMI, STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH REP. BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, (REVENUE
DEPARTMENT), A.P. SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI.
GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2. K VETRI SELVI, DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ELURU. ELURU DISTRICT.

3. P DHATRI REDDY, JOINT COLLECTOR, ELURU. ELURU DISTRICT.

4. M ACHUTA AMBARISH, REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
COLLECTOR OFFICE COMPOUND, ELURU. ELURU DISTRICT.

5. A KRISHNA JYOTHI, TAHSILDAR, PEDAPADU MANDAL, ELURU
DISTRICT.

6. MD ANSARI, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, SURVEY AND LAND
RECORDS, ELURU. ELURU DISTRICT.

7. BOMMI JOGESWARA RAO, MALE AGED 68 YEARS OCC
CULTIVATION S O SURYANARAYANA R O SATYAVOLU V

PEDAQPADU M ELURU DISTRICT

8.BOMMI PRABHAKAR RAO, MALE AGED 65 YEARS OCC
CULTIVATION S O SURYANARAYANA R O SATYAVOLU V
PEDAQPADU M ELURU DISTRICT RR7 AND 8 ARE IMPEADED
PER COURT ORDER DATED 11 07 2025 VIDE I A NO 1 OF 2025 IN C
C NO 1428 OF 2025

...CONTEMNOR(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.B P RAJU

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.THANDAVA YOGESH

2.J DILEEP KUMAR

3.V V PRABHAKARA RAO

The Court made the following:

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Sri B.P. Raju, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Sri G. Hema Sundar, learned Counsel representing Sri J. Dileep Kumar, learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1, 2, 4, 5 & 6, Sri G. Malleswara Reddy, learned Counsel representing Sri Thandava Yogesh, learned Counsel for the Respondent No.3 and Sri Murali Babu D, learned Counsel representing Sri V.V. Prabhakara Rao, learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.7 & 8.

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to paras 4 & 5 of the Order passed by this Court in W.P.No.26531 of 2024 dated 19.11.2024. For determination of the present case, paras 3 to 5 of the Order passed by this Court dated 19.11.2024 in W.P.No.26531 of 2024 are usefully extracted hereunder:

“3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has also drawn the attention of this Court to the copy of the IB register issued by the Revenue Department on 03.10.2024 which indicates that only an extent of

Ac.1.18 cents stood in the name of grandfather of the Writ Petitioner.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner would submit that the Revenue Authorities have reduced the extent owned by the grandfather of the Writ Petitioner from Ac.1.60 cents to Ac.1.18 cents without any notice to the Writ Petitioner in a highhanded, unilateral and arbitrary manner.

5. Having regard to the above facts, the copy of the IB register dated 03.10.2024 is showing the land belonging to the grandfather of the Writ Petitioner as Ac.1.18 cents shall stand suspended until further orders.”

3. The above extract, particularly para 5, would indicate that the 1-B Register dated 03.10.2024 showing that the land belonging to the grandfather of the Writ Petitioner is Acs.1.18 cents instead of Ac.1.60 cents was suspended until further Orders. The present Contempt Case has been filed by the Writ Petitioner complaining against the Unofficial Respondent Nos.7 & 8 in W.P.No.26531 of 2024 that the said Unofficial Respondents have ploughed the land despite an Interim Order of this Court dated 19.11.2024.

4. This Court has perused the content of the Affidavit filed in support of this present Contempt Case as well as the operative portion of the impugned Order dated 19.11.2024. Having perused the same, this Court is of the view that this Court had merely suspended the entry of land details in the 1-B Register dated 03.10.2024 but this Court had not injuncted the Unofficial Respondent Nos.7 & 8 from ploughing the land since the same shall be subject to the final outcome in the Writ Petition.

5. In this view of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that the Unofficial Respondent Nos.7 & 8 have not committed any Contempt of Court, inasmuch as there is no express direction by this Court injuncting the Unofficial Respondent Nos.7 & 8 not to plough the land. It is also clarified that the rights of the parties shall be finally determined in the Writ Petition and the Interim

Order passed by this Court dated 19.11.2024 shall also be subject to the final outcome in the Writ Petition.

6. Accordingly, this Contempt Case is dismissed as being devoid of any merit. No order as to costs.

7. Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand closed in terms of this order.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt:19.02.2026

Vns